

REMARKS

This Response is responsive to the Office Action dated December 1, 2004. Claims 1, 4, 19, 20, 21, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirabayashi, (EP 1189304). Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-12, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Gerraert et al., (EP 1 231 671 A2). Claims 3, 6-8 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerraert et al., (EP 1 231 671 A2) in view of Tran (US 6,215,454). Claims 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirabayashi, (EP 1189304) in view of Gerraert et al., (EP 1 231 671 A2) further in view of Tran (US 6,215,454).

Claims 1, 4-20 have been amended and claim 21 has been cancelled. The applicants hereby request reconsideration of this application in view of the preceding amendments and the remarks that follow.

Claim Rejections under U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 4, 19, 20, 21, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirabayashi, (EP 1189304). The applicants submit that claims 1, 4, 19, 20, 21, and 24 in either their original or presently amended forms are patentable over Hirabayashi. Hirabayashi does not teach or disclose the use of a floating conductor pad but instead provides a ground pattern 14. A floating conductor pad and a ground pad are not the same. The ground pattern is coupled to a ground source whereas a floating conductor pad is not connected to ground or any other voltage supply level, it is floating. The ground pad in Hirabayashi is provided to add shunt capacitance to reduce the resonance frequency of the antenna in Hirabayashi. In contrast, the floating conductor pad is not provided to reduce the resonance frequency of the antenna, but, instead, “positioned to

reduce the level of noise that could couple to the first antenna element.” Consequently, the applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection of the claims based on Hirabayashi and request that the rejection of claims based on this reference be withdrawn. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that independent claims 1,10 and 19 and the claims dependent thereon should be allowed. Please note that amendments to the claims were not made to overcome the Hirabayashi reference.

Claim Rejections under U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-12, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Gerraert et al., (EP 1 231 671 A2). The applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 5, 9-12, and 18 as amended are patentable over Gerraert et al. Independent claims 1 and 10, as amended, both require an antenna element fabricated on a substrate and a floating conductor pad fabricated on a substrate. Neither the balanced antenna or the floating ground 27 of Gerraert et al. are fabricated on a substrate. Thus the features of the claims requiring an antenna element fabricated on a substrate and a floating conductor pad fabricated on a substrate are not taught or suggested by Gerraert et al. In addition, the dependent claims 2, 5-9, 11, 12, and 18 provide further patentable distinctions over the applied reference. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent thereon should be allowed.

Claim Rejections under U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 6-8 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerraert et al., (EP 1 231 671 A2) in view of Tran (US 6,215,454). As discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 10, Gerraert et al. fails to teach or suggest both an antenna

element fabricated on a substrate and a floating conductor pad fabricated on a substrate and further fails to disclose the antenna element fabricated using etching. This combination of elements along with the positioning of the of the floating conductor pad relative to the antenna element as specified in independent claims 1 and 10 are not taught or suggested by either Gerraert et al. (EP 1 231 671 A2) or Tran (US 6,215,454) singularly or in combination. It is therefore submitted that dependent claims 3, 6-8 and 13-17 are patentable over over Gerraert et al., (EP 1 231 671 A2) in view of Tran (US 6,215,454) and should be allowed. Moreover, dependent claims 3, 6-8 and 13-17 provide further patentable distinctions over the applied reference. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that dependent claims 3, 6-8 and 13-17 should be allowed.

Claims 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirabayashi, (EP 1189304) in view of Gerraert et al., (EP 1 231 671 A2) further in view of Tran (US 6,215,454). For the reasons discussed above, Hirabayashi does not anticipate independent claim 19 and therefore does not support a rejection of dependent claims 22-23. In addition these dependent claims provide further patentable distinctions over the applied references. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that claims 22-23 are patentable over the applied references and should be allowed.

Conclusions

In view of the amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If any further action by the applicants is necessary, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the applicants' attorney at the phone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required by this response to the Jones Day Deposit Account #501432, reference 555255-012477.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: April 29, 2005

By: F. D. Feeling
F. Drexel Feeling
Reg. No. 40,602

North Point
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7199